Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 17 1985
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

CASE NO: 84-1962

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JUANITA JOHNSON,

Petitioner-Appellant,

-vs-

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, COMM. THOMAS YOUNT, et al.

Respondent-Appellee

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Juanita Johnson, Pro se,
Rt. #1, Box 8720
Sunrise Acres
Harrison, Tennessee
37341

Telephone Area Code 615)
344-6623

CASE NO:_____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JUANITA JOHNSON,

Petitioner-Appellant,

-vs-

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOY-
MENT SECURITY, COMM. THOMAS YOUNT,
et al.

Respondent-Appellee

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Juanita Johnson, Pro se,
Rt. #1, Box 8720
Sunrise Acres
Harrison, Tennessee
37341

Telephone Area Code (615)
344-6623

IN THE SUPREME COURT

OF THE UNITED STATES

JUANITA JOHNSON,

Petitioner-Appellant,

-vs-

TENNESSEE DEPT. EMPLOYMENT SEC.
COMM. THOMAS YOUNT, et al.

Respondent-Appellee

_____/

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

I. Didn't the Court err in ruling on retaliation? This has been litigated over a year through all state appeals, and appellant won her case?

2. Wasn't Appellant's Constitutional Rights violated?

a. V Amendment-Gross Due Process

b. VIII Amendment, Cruel and unhuman treatment.

c. VIX Amendment, Equal Protection for all.

3. Wasn't Appellant retaliated against because she filed sex discrimination claim?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Questions for Review..	i-ii
Index of authorities..	iv
Petition for Writ of Certiorari.....	1
Concise Statement of the case.....	1
Argument.....	3-12
DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS	
Separation Notice.....	
Decision of Supreme Court dated 1-18-82....	
Court of Appeals Judg- dated 10-6-81.....	
Report dated (Police.. 12=13-78.....	
Police report dated... 2-26-79.....	
Doctor's statements...	
Picture.....	
Certificates of Elig- ibility.....	
Equal Employment Dec.	
Wit-Eddie Burns CSC Trsp.	
Leave Report.....	

EDITOR'S NOTE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

	Pages
Harper v Blumenthal, D.C. D.C., 1979 478 F. Supp. 178	7
Harris v. Richards Mfg. Co., Inc. 511 F. Supp. 1193	12
Randall v. Toll, 73 Misc 21. 2d 451, 341 NYS 2d 994	7
Snead v. Dept. of Social Ser. (DC)NY 355 F. Supp. 764	7
Standard Oil Co., V. F.T.C., D.D. Ind. 1979, 45 Supp. 1261	6
Williams v. Los Angeles Cty. (1978 22 Cal 3 D 731 150 Cal Reptr 475 586 F 2d 956	7
U.S.C. § 2000e2 (a) (1)	1-2
U.S.C. § 2000e (3)	1
U.S.C.A. Due Process 77	
U.S.C.A. § 1981	12
Am Jur 15A 2d § Civil Ser.§ 55	6-8
Am Jur 15A 2d § 64 § 68 § 77	8
T.C.A. § 8-30-326	5
T.C.A. § 8-50-101	8
Civil Ser. Comm. R ule 1120-2-2-.13 (5)	4
Civil Rights Act of 1964 § 701 et seq. 704	12

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

NOW COMES the Petitioner, JUANITA JOHNSON, pro se, and in support of her Petition for Writ of Certiorari indicates as follows:

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE GROUNDS OF JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to Title 28 USCS 42-U.S.C.§ 2000e 2 (a) (1) and 42 USC § 2000e (3)

The date of the judgment sought to be reviewed is December 20, 1984. (Judgement of the Six Circuit Court of Appeals Docket 83 5306.)

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

NOW comes the Petitioner, JUANITA JOHNSON, PRO SE, and in support of her Petition for Writ of Certiorari, indicates as follows:

On December 20, 1984, a panel of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the Federal Court decision discharge of a 24 year state employee, even tho Petitioner

was orderd out of her place of (24) years employment transpassing,(Cruel and unhuman treatment without any warning, no reason and not allowed to defend herself, police (App. E) Even tho Comm. wasn't aware of this fraud. (App. B) This is certainly GROSS DUE PROCESS, Tenn. Courts ruled in Petitioner's favor. (App. C & D) When Comm. Brooks Parker found out about this fraud she was only suspended two days and due back to work. She attempted to report for work as directed (even tho she was scared because A. C. Wilson, Manager of office called her at 11:20 at night and ordered her never to step foot into the office again) by Comm. Legal Auth., and police was called again. (exh. "F") Her husband was outside of office. This shouldn't have been litigated again on retaliation, res judicata, only on discrimination on promotions, 42-U.S.C. §2000e 2 (a) (1). Petitioner asked

for a new trial but it was denied.

ARGUMENT

Didn't the Court err in ruling on Retaliation? Petitioner won her case back in Oct. 6, 1981 and Supreme Court ruled 1=18=82 . That was over a year before Federal Court hearing (exh. C &D)

This is RES Judicata - a thing decided; a matter adjudged. Doctrine by which "a final judgment by a Court of competent jurisdiction is conclusive upon the parties in any subsequent litigation involving the same cause of action.... The policy underlying the doctrine of res judicata is one of repose, the same policy which reflected in the statute of limitations. Company collateral estoppel. COLLATERAL ATTACK the doctrine which recognizes that the determination of facts litigated between two parties in a proceeding is binding on those parties in all future proceedings

against one another.

This has been very long and very costly to Petitioner. She should be re-instated back to her job she was working on December 13, 1978.

15A Am Jur 2 d Civil Service

* * * *

Reinstatement of a discharged civil service employee calls for reinstatement to the position to which she was entitled at the time of discharge....

§ 50 Civil Service

Wasn't Petitioner's Constitutional Rights Violated?

Where Juanita Johnson was illegally ordered from work after (24 years) without warning, no notice, no reason, told never to return, transpassing, police called (App E) without a chance to say anything. This shocked her. The legal authority Brooks Parker, Comm. didn't know

thing about it and didn't go a long with it.

Both T.C.A. § 8-30-326 and Civil Service Commission Rule 1120-2-2-/13 (5) require that the employee be notified of the reasons and Petitioner was ordered' back into work but police was called again when she attempted to go to work. This is cruel and unhuman treatment. (Amend 8)

Amendment 14-equal protection has been violated many times. Petitioner was not guilty of anything. These people wanted herjob. Some of these were forged signatures. She had approximately 166 days sick leave and lost all of it. (Exh. N)

The Concept of due process of law has a due aspect, Substantive and Procedural. Substantive due process DEFINED as the Constitutional guaranty that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or pro-

perty by arbitrary reason. Procedural due process of law requires that, before a person may be deprived of life, liberty or property he must be given notice of the proceedings against him, he/she must be given a hearing and an opportunity to be heard, to defend herself. This has destroyed Petitioner, health, reputation, career, etc. by such cruel and unhuman treatment. (Exh. I;

Section 55 Civil Service 15A Am Jur 2d Where the whole power of appointment to, and removal or suspension from a particular position rests in one officer, absolutely void and of no effect if issued by another.

15. Hearing and Notice U.S.C.A. Page 77 Due Process of Law

Essence of due process is requirement of prior notice of charges against a person a fair opportunity to be heard before....Standard Oil Co. v. F.T.C., D.D. Ind., 1979, 475 Supp. 1261.

Liberty, definition of-For Procedural Due Process purposes, and individual's Liberty interest is impaired where the government's action injures either her good name, reputation or integrity or where it imposes a stigma or other disability that forecloses his freedom to take advantage of other employment opportunities....

Harper v. Blumenthal, D.C.D.C. 1979, 478 F. Supp. 176.

§§ 64 15A Am Jur 2d page 93 Section 68

A removal of Civil Service employee or suspension statute which failed to provide for notice and hearing for discharge or suspension of any employee may be unconstitutional. - Snead v Department of Social Services (DC) NY 355 F. Supp 764 vacated on other grounds 421US 982 44 L.ED 2d 474, 95 S.Ct. 1985, holding a statute unconstitutional by reason of its failure to provide for adversarial hearing prior to Civil Service on suspension or leave up to 1 year for mental unfitness

The view has been taken that the Constitutional guaranty of due process before even temporary suspension.... RANDALL v. TOLL, 73 Mis,2d 451, 341 NYS 2d 994, holding that a civil service employee...without notice or hearing be reinstated....

Williams V. Los-Angeles Cty.
(1978)22 Cal 3 D 731. 150 Cal Rptr 475. 586 P 2d 956.

T.C.A. 8-50-101

* * * *

...The appointing authority shall not refuse sick leave if has dr. statement.

These people have said first one thing and then another. (Exh. G & H)

15A Am Jur 2d § CIVIL SERVICE

* * * *

...But members of the classified Civil Service who have been improperly and wrongfully induced to tender their resignations by threats or promises made by or on behalf... shall be re-instated.

Am Jur 15A 2d P 83...Retirement because disable does not constitue "removal" within a statute requiring hearing of a civil service employee for incompetence or misconduct.

Petitioner was in shock on 12-13-78 from such treatment.

She has worked twenty=four years in state government and was certainly entitled to a promotion. This has destroyed her career and reputation. Am Jur 15A 2d § 77 Reinstatment after suspension....

Wasn't Petitioner retaliated against because she filed her sex discrimination claim? This was filed October of 1977.

Petitioner filed her sex discrimination claim because - since 1973, six males were made over her in the claims department. She has been transferred around in claims but when she a asked for a transfer it was refused. She was on the list for appeals referee in 1975 and the male that received the promotion wasn't on the promotional list. (ExJ & K)

She was also at top o list on Claims Adjudicater and a male was

given this job over her. (Exh. J) Four other males with just a couple of years there were also promoted. Discrimination stated, "It's uncontested that a male was promoted over her." She was issued a right to sue letter on Aug. 28, 1980 (Exh.L)

Petitioner filed her charge with discrimination and thereafter, her superiors began to retaliate against her for filing the complaint.

Sara Stanley deliberately hit Petitioner and admitted it. She repeatedly screamed at her, would slam her chair back at her when she got up.

A Supervisor from Nashville, A. J. Elmore, watched her one day. Petitioner wishes she could convince the Court that she isn't the one that is lying. She is the victim of Cruel and Unhuman treatment. Appellant gave the best years to state government and to be treated this way

is terrible. She never mistreated anyone, the public was her job. (Exh. M. TRS CSC PP. 3-7-11)

Enforcement-Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEO) initiated Court action or the person or someone representing the person. 42 § 2000e-5 Retaliation - In order to establish a prima facie case (elements) where an alleged retaliatory discharge is involved, and employee must how: (1) that he/she engaged in a protected activity such as filing a Commission charge; (2) the employer knew of this protected activity such as filing a charge (3) that he was subsequently discharged or subjected to other damages; and (4) that employer had a retaliatory motive. Petitioner has established all of these. Petitioner tried to get a promotion many times. She has not received a promotion in twenty-two years.

That's a long time not to get a promotion as qualified as she is.

Plaintiff ws on the list for all these promotions. (Ex. J&K) Petitioner was forced to take her case to Court because she was threatened and could not get into work. (Exh. B) told to report. (Exh. E&F threatened.

Petitioner Cites: 42 U.S.C.A. § 1981.

Harris V. Richards Mfg. Co., Inc., 511 F Supp. 1193.
This case is similiar to Petitioner. Civil Rights Act of 1964 §§ 701 et seq. 704 Plaintiff lost all her sick leave, yet ordered to doctor, humilated (Exh. N) yet she was forced on involuntary retirement. This stigma' has destroyed her.

Wherefore, PETITIONER PRAYS:

(A) That, she be re-instated with promotions;

(B) That the defendants be permanently enjoined from engaging in the unlawful unemployment practices

(C) That the defendants be required to pay back pay, pension, Attys.

CONCLUSION

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, Petitioner Juanita Johnson respectfully requests that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Juanita Johnson

JUANITA JOHNSON, PRO SE,
Rt. #1. Box 8720
Sunrise Acres
Harrison, Tenn.,
37341

Telephone Area Code (615)
344-6623

Dated 4-12-85

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY TERM, 1985

No. 83-5306

JUANITA JOHNSON,

APPELLANT,

V.

TENN. DEPT. EMPLOY-
MENT SECURITY, COMM.
THOMAS YOUNT, ET AL.

APPELLEE,

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF TENNESSEE|

COUNTY OF HAMILTON|

JUANITA JOHNSON, after being duly sworn, deposes and says that pursuant to Rule 28.4 (a) of this Court she served the within PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR SIXTH CIRCUIT on counsel for the Appellee by enclosing a copy thereof in an envelope, first class postage prepaid, addressed to:

Asst. Atty. Gen. Frank Scanlon,
450 James Robertson Parkway,
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

and depositing same in the United States mails at Harrison, Tennessee, on 16 day of FEB 1985.

Subscribed and Sworn to Before me
this 16 day of FEBRUARY 1985

Paul F. McDaniel
NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR SAID
COUNTY AND STATE My commission expires OCT 7, 1986

IN THE SUPREME COURT

OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY TERM, 1985

NO. 83-5306

JUANITA JOHNSON,
APPELLANT,

VS

TENN. DEPT. EMPLOY-
SECURITY,
APPELLEE.

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF TENNESSE)

COUNTY OF HAMILTON)

JUANIT JOHNSON, After being fully sworn, deposes and says that pursuant to Rule 28.4 (a) of this court she served the within PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR SIXTH CIRCUIT on counsel for the Appelles by enclosing a copy thereof in an envelope,

first class postage prepaid, addressed to:

Asst. Atty. Gen. Fran Scanlon
450 James Robertson Parkway,
Nashville, Tennessee, 37219

and depositing same in the United States mail at Harrison, Tennessee, on 16 day of Feb. 1985.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 16th day of February, 1985.

Notary Public
/S/ Paul F. McDaniel
Notary Public in and for
said county, and State.

My Commission expires Oct. 7, 1986.

No. 83-5306

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

JUANITA JOHNSON,
Plaintiff

vs

STATE OF TENNESSE
DEPARTMENT OF EMP.
SECURITY,
Defendant

Before: MARTIN AND JONES, CIRCUIT Judges; and BROWN, Senior Circuit Judge.

PER CURIAM. Juanita Johnson appeals the decision of the district court dismissing her claim of sex discrimination and retaliation. Johnson claims that she was passed over for promotions because of her sex in violation of 42 U.S.C.§ 2000e-3. The district judge, following a trial without a jury. found that the evidence was overwhelmingly against the plaintiff,

Appendix A(1)

and he denied her relief.

Although Johnson's brief is very unclear, she is apparently claiming in this appeal that the evidence was in sufficient to support the district court's decision. We find this claim to be completely without merit. The record is replete with evidence that Johnson was not promoted and was eventually fired not because of her sex but because of her inability to work with others and her irrational outbursts at work. In reviewing a district court's factual findings, we may only reverse if the findings are clearly erroneous. Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a). In this case, the district judges's conclusions are clearly correct. The opinion of the district court is therefore affirmed.

Appendix A(2)

COPY

State of Tennessee
Department of Employment Security
Nashville, Tennessee
December 27, 1981

Mrs. Juanita Johnson,
Route # 1, Sunrise Acres,
Harrison, Tenn. 37341

Dear Mrs. Johnson:

This is to advise you that you are being suspended without pay for a period of two days as Interviewer in the Chattanooga Unemployment Insurance Office. This suspension is a result of an occurance in the Chattanooga office on December 13. It is my understanding that you are completely aware of the reasons for my taking this action.

This suspension will begin at 8:00 a.m. December 14, 1978 and extend through 4:30 p.m., December 15, 1978. Your first day back on the payroll will be December 17, 1978. It is my understanding that you will be on leave for personal reasons at that

Appendix B(1)

time. I regret taking this action but feel that it is necessary based upon the incident previously mentioned. Any further conduct of this nature could result in more serious disciplinary action.

Yours very truly,

[signed]Brooks Parker,
Brooks Parker,
Commissioner,

BP:JWT:kb
cc: Department of Personnel

Appendix B(2)

JUANITA JOHNSON

Plaintiff

vs.

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY. COMMISSIONER ROBERT J. BIBLE,

Defendant

D VIDSON
E UITY

COURT OF APPEALS OF TENNESSEE

MIDDLE SECTION AT NASHVILLE

APPEALED FROM THE SEVENTH CHANCERY

DIVISION DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE

THE HONORABLE C. ALLEN HIGH, CHANCELLOR

FILED Oct. 6,1981

JUANITA JOHNSON PRO SE
Rt. #1, Sunrise Acres
Harrison, Tenn. 37341

WILLIAM M. LEECH, JR.
Atty. Gen, State of Tennesse
CLAUDIUS C. SMITH
Asst. Atty. Gen. State of Tenn.
450 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee

RANDALL HARRIS
STAFF ATTY. State of Tennesse
Department of Emp. Security
Nashville, Tennessee

REVERSED AND REMANDED

SAMUEL L. LEWIS
JUDGE

Appendix C(1)

JUANITA JOHNSON)
Plaintiff)
)
Vs.) DAVIDSON
) EQUITY
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF)
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,)
)
COMMISSIONER ROBERT J.)
BIBLE)
Defendant)

O P I N I O N

This case is before this Court on appeal from the Chancellor's affirming of a decision of the Tennessee Civil Service Commission upholding the dismissal of appellant Juanita Johnson as an employee of the State of Tennessee.

Appellant was employed as an Interviewer with the Department of Employment Security at its Chattanooga and Cleveland offices for approximately twenty-four years. She received a letter from Ronald G. Mammontree, Acting Commissioner of the Department of Employment security, dated January 30. 1979, terminating her employment effective February 28,. 1979.

Appendix C(2)

The determination issue is whether or not appellant received adequate notification of the charges against herprior to her dismissal.

Tennessee Code Annotated § 8-3226 (now 8-30-326) provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

> Dismissal. - Appointing authority may dismiss any regular employee in his division when he considers that the good of the service will be served thereby. No dismissal of a regular shall take effect. unless at least ten (10) days before the effective date thereof the appointing authority gives notice to such employee and files a written statement with the commissioner. The employee shall have an opportunity to file with the appointing authority a written statement regarding the proposed dismissal, a copy of which shall be filed with the commissioner A regular employee who is dismissed shall have the right to appeal to the commission in the manner provided in S 8-30-327.

The Civil Service Commission has adopted Rule 1120-2-2-.13(5) which corresponds to the foregoing statute and is as follows:

> Dismissals. -- An appointing authority may dismiss any employee whenever he considers that the good of the service will be served thereby. The appointing authority shall give the employee at least ten (10) days notice, including the reasons in writing amd at the time of giving such notice shall file a written statement of the reasons for the dismissal with the Commissioner. A dismissed employee shall have the right to answer in writing the statement of the appointing authority as to the cause for his dismissal and to file this and any other affidavits and exhibits in support of his statement with the Commissioner, provided such statements and records are filed within fifteen (15) days after the effective date of the dismissal.

Both T.C.A. § 8-3-326 and Civil Service Commission Rule 1120-2-2-.13(5) require that the employee be notified of the reasons for dismissal.

In a letter dated December 18, 1978. Mr. Sam J. McAllester, Jr., Chief Counsel for the Department of Employment Security. wrote to Mr. John T. Fort, who was then Appellant's attorney, as follows:

Appendix C(4)

Dear John:

I am herewith enclosing Summary of Personnel Record - May 1970 to August 1978 as you requested. I am also herewith enclosing application for disability retirement. There is no instruction booklet issued but you might check Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 8-3901 et seq. for instructions.

Confirming our conversation of Thursday, December 14 and telephone conversation thisdate, we recommended that rather than discharge your client, that she take leave in order to secure medical evaluations with subsequent application for disability retirement. It is recommended that she take annual leave from December 18 through December 31 in order to secure such evaluations.

Ms. Johnson has more than 30 days accumulated annual leave and more than 160 days sick leave. The sick leave can be added to years of service upon retirement.

Also stated to you, under no circumstamces will Ms. Johnson be reemployed even if she is denied disability retirement. The offer of annual leave was an effort on the part of the department to prevent her from losing any rights that she might have for her 24 years service.

Appendix C(5)

We will furnish any information in our office to assist you or the physician to make a proper evaluation.

With Best Regards,

/s/ Sam

Sam J. McAllester,.Jr.,
Chief Counsel:

We note that this letter infers that appellant had been terminated. The letter also refers to appellant's personnel record from May 1970 to August 1978 which Mr. Fort had requested. This letter does not in anywise refer to this personnel record or anything contained therein as being reason for appellant's dismissal.

Thereafter, on December 17, 1978, Brooks Parker, Commissioner of the Department of Employment Security, wrote to Appellant and told her that she had been suspended for two days. This letter is clearly a letter of suspension and not a dismissal. The final sentence of the December 27, 1978, letter reads: "Any further conduct

Appendix C (6)

of this nature could result in more serious disciplinary action."

On January 1, 1979, Mr. McAllester wrote Mr. Fort stating: Through lack of communication, the letter from the Commissioner dated December 27, 1978, was sent to you in error. I was out of town on this day and the day you called in regard to it."

Thereafter, on January 30, 1979, Mr. Ronald Hammomtree, Deputy Comm. wrote, the following letter directly to appellant:

Dear Mrs. Johnson:

> Your letter to the Chief of Personnel has been referred to me for answer.
>
> Because pf your actions on December 13, 1978, you were ordered from the premises of the claims office. Upon considerations of the circumstances and your long years of service you were not fired at this time.
>
> Mr. Sam McAllester and your attorney met and agreed that you would take annual leave so that you would have time to apply for disability retirement. On December 18, 1978, Mr. McAllester confired this agreement with your attorney, John Fort.

Appendix C(7)

> On December 28, 1978, Commissioner Parker wrote you suspending you for two days (December 13, and 14) and placing you on leave on December 17. On December 29 you attempted to return to work but were advised not to appear.
>
> On January2, 1979, Mr. McAllester wrote Mr. Fort explaining the Commissioner's letter. Mr. McAllester again wrote on January 17, 1979, advising the amount of retirement you wpuld receive. Mr. McAllester wrote Mr. Fort on January 18 advising that your annual leave would be exhausted after four and one-half hours on February 28, 1979; and, at that time, you would be terminated.
>
> Due to the long history of your actions, of which you have had adequate notice, we feel that there is no other alternative other than to terminate you on exhaustion of your annual leave on February 28, 1979. We will assist you in every way possible to secure disability or regular retirement.

We can only conclude from all of this that appellant was not dismissed by the December 18, 1978 letter, it necessarily being countermanded by the Commissioner's letter of December 27. Both T.C.A. § 8-30-326 and Civil Service commission Rule 1120-2-2-.13(5) provide

Appendix C (8)

that the appointingauthority may dismiss any regular employee. We find nothing eitherin Civil Service Rule 1120-2-2-.13(5) or in T.C.A. S8-30-326 which allows the authority to dismiss to be delegated to anyone else in the department. However, even if the December 18 letter could construd as an effective dismissal, it does not state the reasons why and the forty-eight pages of unedited general work records, some of it favorable to appellant, can hardly be said without more to constitute due notice of reasons for dismissal. This is especially true since the personnel records by appellant's attorney and no where in any of the correspondence, either to appellant or to her attorney, is there a reference to the personnel record containing reasons for dismissal. We are unable to find anything in the file which provides appellant or her attorney any guidance as to what specific part of her work record was the cause of her dismissal.

We are not unmindful of State Board of Regents of University v. Gray 561 S.W. 2d140 (Tenn. 1978). wherein the Court (quoting from Covington V. Anderson, 84 Tenn., 310 (1886) stated:

> "The rule upon the question of notice is that whatever is sufficient to put a person upon inquiry will lead when prosecuted with reasonable diligence and in good faith . . . . Means of knowledge with the duty of using them are deemed equivalent to knowledge itself, and passive good faith will not serve to excuse willful ignorance."

Id. at 143

We are of the opinion after a full review of the record that the notice in the case at bar is not sufficient to put appellant upon inquiry.

The Court was apprised during oral argument that appellant had applied for and was presently receiving disability retirement benefits. Appellee was requested by the

Court to file motion to consider post-judgment facts so the Court could consider the fact of appellant receiving disability benefits if necessary.

It appears from the motion that appellant is presently receiving, and has been receiving since March 6, 1979, disability retirement benefits from the Tennessee Consolidated Retirement System

s On remand, the Chancellor will determine what relief, if any, appellant is entitled to receive, taking her retirement benefits into account. Either party may offer additional evidence to aid the Chancellor in making this determination.

We have considered but,. in view of our holding, pretermit each of the other issues raised by appellant.

Appendix C (11)

The judgment of the Chancellor in affirming the decision of the Civil Service Commission is reversed and the cause is remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

/S/ Samuel L. Lewis

Samuel L. Lewis, Judge

CONCUR:

/S/ HENRY F. TODD,

HENRY F. TODD, PRESIDING JUDGE, M.S.

/S/ LEWIS H. CONNER, JR.

LEWIS H. CONNER, JR., JUDGE

Appendix C (2)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE

AT NASHVILLE

JUANITA JOHNSON PETITIONER	
VS.	DAVIDSON EQUITY
TENN.DEPT EMP., SEC. et al	

ORDER

Upon consideration of the application for permission to appeal and the answer thereto, the briefs of counsel and the entire record, the Court is of the opinion that the application should be denied, with concurrence in the result only.

PER CURIAM

Appendix D

Chattanooga Police Department Incident report

Date 12-13-78 1525 hrs

Tenn. Dept. Employment Security

Police was called at above location Mr. Wilson head of the above office advise police that he had asked a Mrs. Johnson Employee of the Office to Leave the office but Mrs. Johnson had refused to do so.

Police asked Mrs. Johnson to leave and eventually she did.

[signed]

Greg Oglesby

Appendix E

CHATTANOOGA POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT

Police was called asked by Mr.wilson to ask Mrs. Johnson outside of the working area of his dept., Police did so. Mrs. Johnson is a 24 year employee.

DATE 2-26-79

/S/ GREGG OGBSBY

Appendix I

STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL
CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY

DATE 4-26-77

32 JOHNSON, JUANITA B. 409-46-2107

score 82

30 Toliver, John, Chattanooga,

408-88-7148 score 76

Appendix G

LAKESIDE CLINIC, INC.
4626 Highway 58
Chattanooga, Tenn. 37416

To Whom It May Concern:

JUANITA JOHNSON was seen in my office on 1-23-79 and will be able to return to work/school on 1-26-79.

/S/ Jim B. Davis, M.D.
Linda Headrick, Recpt.

Appendix H

REID L. BROWN, M.D.
1019 McCallie Ave.
Chattanooga, Tenn.,

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

It is recommended that Mrs.Johnson be placed on sick leave due to mental harassment in present working contions. remain on sick leave until a transfer can be worked out.

/S/ Reid L. Brown, M.D.
Reid L. Brown, M.D.

Appendix I

Copy

State of Tennessee

Department of Personnel

Attendance and Leave record

Position number 33302.0903.11

JUANITA JOHNSON

Beginning 12-15-78 and ending 12-31-78

Leave Annual 42 sick 166 days

Appendix J